

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/024,674	SIBBETT, SCOTT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alan Diamond	1753	

All Participants:

(1) Alan Diamond.

(2) Julia Hodge.

Status of Application: rejected

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 February 2005

Time: 1:15 p.m. ET

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
None

Claims discussed:
None

Prior art documents discussed:
None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner inquired as to whether a response has been filed to the Office action mailed July 22, 2004, or if the application is to go abandoned. Ms. Hodge said that she never knew that an Office action had been mailed, and that when the file was transferred from the previous law firm (Schwegman) there was no Office action in it. The Examiner said that the case would have to go abandoned (more than 6 months from the July 22, 2004 mail date), and that Applicant could petition to revive. The Examiner noted that the mail log of the Schwegman law firm around when the Office action would have been received would be helpful in determining whether the Office action was received.